

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION
5702 Gulfstream Road
Richmond, Virginia 23250-2400

VIRGINIA AVIATION BOARD MEETING

August 23, 2007

WYNDHAM HOTEL AND RESORT
5700 Atlantic Avenue
Virginia Beach, Virginia

9:00 A.M.

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.
4914 Fitzhugh Avenue - Suite 203
Richmond, Virginia 2323
Tel. No. (804) 355-4335

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1
2 VAB Attendees on August 22, 2007
3 MR. ROGER L. OBERNDORF, Chairman
4 MS. MARIANNE RADCLIFF, Vice Chairman
5 MR. RANDALL P. BURDETTE, Director
6 Department of Aviation
7 MR. TERRY J. PAGE, Manager FAA, WADO
8 MR. BOB DIX, REGION 1
9 MR. RICHARD C. FRANKLIN, JR, Region 6
10 MR. WILLIAM J. KEHOE, Region 5
11 MR. JOHN J. BEALL, JR.
12 Senior Assistant Attorney General
13 DOAV Staff, Federal Government Reporesentatives, Airport
14 Managers and Sponsors, Consultants, Engineers, State
15 Government Representatives, Business Owners, and City
16 and County Representatives
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1

2 NOTE: The second day meeting of the Virginia
3 Aviation Board is called to order. The giving away door
4 prizes is had; instructions are given with reference to
5 transportation arrangements for lunch and the Military
6 Aviation Museum; whereupon the meeting, begins, as
7 follows:

8 MR. OBERNDORF: Mike Swain, continuing with the
9 allocations.

10 MR. SWAIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board,
11 the Director, Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. We
12 have three regions to cover this morning, and we are
13 scheduled to go to noon, so I will talk really, really
14 slow.

15 For the folks in the audience, there
16 are some summary sheets if you weren't here yesterday on
17 both desks in the back if you want to follow along with
18 the projects and the amounts of funding that are being
19 recommended. And according to the schedule, we are
20 supposed to start with Region 3 this morning.

21 And the first request, Page 79, comes
22 from Culpeper Regional. We have four requests from
23 Culpaper. The first is an Archaeological Study, Phase 3
24 and Form C Environmental Assessment, \$8,100.00.
25 Terminal Area Site Preparation Construction,

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 \$418,068.52. Terminal Building Design, \$32,500.00. And
2 Terminal Building Utilities Construction, \$13,176.22.
3 On the Archaeological Study, the staff recommends funding
4 this project. On the Terminal Area Site Preparation,
5 the staff recommends funding this project. On the
6 Terminal Building Design, the staff recommends funding
7 this project. And on the Terminal Building Utilities
8 the staff recommends funding this project.

9 Next, Front Royal-Warren County.
10 Request Land Acquisition Services, Environmental Form C
11 Increase, in the amount of \$600.00. T-hangar Site Prep
12 Construction, Phase 1, is a T-hangar Site Preparation,
13 Phase 1, Construction \$432,533.84. Land Acquisition
14 Services, the staff recommends funding this project. On
15 the T-hangar Site Preparation the staff recommends
16 funding this project.

17 Next is Gordonsville Municipal. Fuel
18 Tank, AV gas, Replacement and Credit Card Reader Design
19 Construction, requesting \$55,104.82. And Fueling
20 System, AV Gas Tank Removal Design Construction,
21 \$12,012.00. On the Fuel Tank AV Gas Replacement
22 project, the staff recommends not funding this project
23 as the airport has unmitigated 24 VAC 5-20-140
24 obstructions, which is safe standard obstructions. Now
25 the Fueling System Tank Removal project, the staff

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 recommends not funding the project due to unmitigated
2 safe standards.

3 Yes, sir.

4 MR. OMPS: Mike, this is before my time, I'm
5 just amongst continuing discretion, the Board put
6 together the funding to try to get the tank out of the
7 ground, if possible. The only reason this was not
8 approved was because of the construction? Is that
9 correct?

10 MR. SWAIN: That is correct. Yes, sir.
11 According to the Board policy, the only projects that
12 would be eligible today would be an obstruction of a
13 project, and the airport is in the process of updating
14 their ALC at this time and evaluating their obstruction;
15 using an allocation and grant that was approved a few
16 Board meetings ago. Once that is completed, hopefully
17 they would then move to the mitigation phase.

18 MR. OMPS: Even though they have a low priority
19 number, that is a national priority isn't it for the
20 Board, getting these tanks out of the gound?

21 MR. BURNETT: No.

22 MR. OMPS: That is just what I was told. I
23 don't know. I'm asking you.

24 MR. SWAIN: Well, you could, once you say it is
25 a priority due to the fact that fuel tank removal is

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 funded at 80 percent, based on Board policy, versus the
2 one third/one half/two thirds funding for fuel tank, new
3 fuel tank systems.

4 MR. SWITZER: Mr. Omps, if I may, that was the
5 reason that the Board got in the fuel farm business, was
6 to provide, start to provide assistance. It was
7 somewhat of a priority back then because the rules were
8 changing, and it was necessary to do that, say that it's
9 a high priority like say a safety obstruction issue. I
10 don't know if the Board has expressed that to the
11 Department.

12 MR. OMPS: I welcome the education.

13 MR. DIX: Are these tanks in use now?

14 MR. SWITZER: Uh, Vernon?

15 VERNON: I just want to make one comment, I
16 believe those tanks are above ground tanks. I don't
17 believe they are underground.

18 MR. DIX: Oh, it is? Okay.

19 MR. SWAIN: Oh, is it really?

20 VERNON: I'm not certain, but I believe there is
21 an above ground tank.

22 BOARD MEMBER: I have seen an above ground tank
23 there. The narrative states an old tank is a
24 maintenance problem, does not accept a full tanker load,
25 so it must be less than eight thousand gallons. But it

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 is still under eligibility removing old tanks. I don't
2 believe it specifies underground tanks, part of the
3 policy fuel system removal, the 80 percent.

4 MR. OMPS: Thank you.

5 MR. SWAIN: Leesburg Executive Airport next.
6 The first request is for Land Acquisition Runway 17
7 Runway Protection Zone, this is a missed opportunity
8 request. \$7,500.00. And the second Land Acquisition
9 Services for Runway 17 Runway Protection Zone and Future
10 Development, also missed opportunity, \$1,500.00. On the
11 Land Acquisition 17 RPZ, staff recommends funding this
12 project. And on the Land Acquisition Services, the
13 staff recommends funding this project. This change, the
14 missed opportunity came about due to a change in FAA
15 program. The monies were funded for different projects
16 which the airport requested, and then the FAA program
17 switched after the dead line, and that was the reason
18 that they came in for a late request for this change.

19 Next, Luray Caverns. First project is
20 Land Acquisition for Obstruction Removal Runway Object
21 Free Area Part 77 surfaces, Phase 2, \$5,914.20.
22 Maintenance Equipment Storage Building Design
23 Construction, \$25,000. Spill Prevention Control and
24 Countermeasures Plan, \$4,752.80. Terminal Building
25 Study, \$28,426.40. And T-hangar Site Preparation Design

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Construction \$476,020.00. The Land Acquisition for
2 Obstruction Removal, the staff recommends funding this
3 project. Maintenance Equipment Storage Building, the
4 staff recommends funding this project. Spill Prevention
5 Control and Countermeasures Plan, the staff recommends
6 funding this project. Terminal Building Study, the
7 staff recommends not funding this project due to
8 insufficient CAF funds based on priority. The T-hangar
9 Site Preparation, the staff recommends funding this
10 project.

11 MR. KEHOE: I might bring it to your attention,
12 that they presented me last night with a list of all the
13 T-hangars that they had requested. And \$250 deposit on
14 each one of them, and it exceeds the number of hangars
15 they are going to build. So it's not like (cannot
16 understand end of remarks) And the good news is that
17 VRA has got money (drops voice and cannot hear)

18 MR. SWAIN: I would like to make a point if
19 anyone notices the score, the sponsor is actually
20 funding 40 -- This is the one I mentioned yesterday, but
21 I didn't mention the airport name, is actually funding
22 43 percent of the project in lieu of 20. I believe they
23 obtained a loan from the U. S. Department of Agriculture
24 at a good rate. So they did receive extra points, 1
25 point for every percent above and beyond the 20 percent,

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 typical local share. That's one reason you see a high
2 score on this project.

3 Next, which is several pages deep, on
4 Page 99. Manassas Regional. Project request Access
5 Road and Parking Lot Rehabilitation Design Construction,
6 \$77,155.20. Airport Entrance Signage Plan, \$5,540.00.
7 East Ramp Rehabilitation and Expansion, Phase 3,
8 Construction, \$90,000.00. Internal Connector Road
9 Design, \$3,000.00. And Taxiway Delta Rehabilitation
10 Design, \$3,000.00. On the Access Road and Parking Lot
11 Rehab Project, the staff recommends funding this
12 project. Airport Entrance Signage Plan, the staff
13 recommends funding this project. East Ramp
14 Rehabilitation and Expansion, the staff recommends
15 funding this project. Internal Connector Road, the
16 staff recommends funding this project. And Taxiway
17 Delta Rehabilitation, the staff recommends funding this
18 project.

19 Orange County. First project, Land
20 Acquisition for Obstruction Removal, \$15,000. Terminal
21 Area Site Preparation Design, \$40,000. And Terminal
22 Building Design, \$94,672.00. On the Land Acquisition
23 for Obstruction Removal, the staff recommends funding
24 this project. The obstructions are currently mitigated.
25 These are Part 77 obstructions that they want to take

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 down all the way, so they don't have to rely on the
2 threshold siding in order to mitigate them. The
3 Terminal Area Site Preparation Design project, the staff
4 recommends funding this project. Terminal Building
5 Design, the staff recommends funding this project.

6 Next is Stafford Regional. Have
7 request for Apron Expansion, Phase 2 Construction,
8 \$30,000.00. Terminal Area Site Preparation Design,
9 \$63,419.75. And Terminal Building Design, \$103,455.47.
10 On the Apron Expansion, the staff recommends funding
11 this project. On the Terminal Area Site Preparation,
12 the staff recommends funding this project. On the
13 Terminal Building Design, the staff recommends funding
14 this project.

15 BOARD MEMBER: Going back to Orange County. I'm
16 sorry. (Unable to hear) How big is the terminal
17 supposed to be?

18 MR. SWAIN: This is a pretty large one. And the
19 state funding is approximately 49 1/2 percent, around 50
20 percent. If I remember correctly it's a two story
21 building. The second floor is going to be mostly
22 offices for economic, County economic development
23 offices. But, like any terminal building, we run the
24 numbers on the twenty year operation forecast. And we
25 have maximum square footages, for restrooms, for flight

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 planning and everything. Most airports build out to
2 those maximums. So the study has been approved. It
3 meets the policy on square footages. Some areas they
4 may build over the max, but they pay for that one
5 hundred percent.

6 BOARD MEMBER: (Again unable to hear.)

7 MR. SWAIN: Site preparation is 80 percent
8 funded, because this is, technically everything outside
9 the five foot perimeter of the building, particularly
10 the parking lot and access, and even if it wasn't for
11 the terminal building, that's an 80 percent project;
12 therefore it's 80 percent. Within five foot, including
13 design of the building, based on the public use area,
14 which is approximately 50, I don't remember the exact
15 number.

16 BOARD MEMBER: (Cannot hear)

17 MR. SWAIN: I just need to do the math on it.
18 The narrative shows 50.6 on the public use. I believe
19 it's just a little under like 49.5 based on our
20 calculations.

21 BOARD MEMBER: (Again unable to hear and
22 understand)

23 MR. SWAIN: I understand. We will get back with
24 you on that.

25 I believe we had read the

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 recommendations for Stafford already, so the staff is
2 recommending funding all three of those projects.

3 Winchester Regional. Four requests.
4 First is Land Acquisition for Runway Protection Zone.
5 APR Mini Storage Parcel, and then Parcel 53, \$27,000.00.
6 Runway 14-32 Rehabilitation and Runway Lighting Upgrade
7 Design, \$6,000.00. Terminal Building Renovation Design,
8 \$124,000.00. And T-hangar Taxiway Rehabilitation
9 Design, \$24,000.00. Land Acquisition, staff recommends
10 funding this project. Runway 14-32 Rehabilitation, the
11 staff recommends funding this project. Terminal
12 Building Renovation, the staff recommends not funding
13 this project due to insufficient CAF funds based on
14 priority. And T-Hangar Taxiway Rehabilitation, the
15 staff recommends funding this project.

16 MR. KEHOE: Mike --

17 MR. SWAIN: Yes, sir.

18 MR. KEHOE: -- I have a question. I'm not
19 picking on Winchester. I just have a question. The
20 taxiway, T-hangar taxiway rehabilitation design, that is
21 simply overlaying what we already have? Is that
22 correct?

23 MR. SWAIN: My understanding the pavement is I
24 don't know if it's distress or it's actually increasing
25 the capacity for possible Gulfstream. Mr. Longmaker?

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 MR. LONGMAKER: Yes. It's a reconstruction from
2 the LC manual -- -- old pavement, and it's completely
3 allocated for sales structurally and because it's raised
4 max the building reconstruct the pavement (unable to.
5 understand)

6 MR. SWAIN: You say you are going to tear it out
7 totally?

8 MR. LONGMAKER: (Unable to hear and understand)

9 Rae, I understand that you would like to invite
10 the Board to do something? Would you like to invite
11 them? Stand up and formally do it?

12 MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Yes, sir. I would like to
13 invite the Board to come up there and join us for lunch
14 one day, whenever it's convenient for the members to
15 attend. And we would like to give them a tour of the
16 airport. We have made quite an investment and a lot of
17 state salaries in the improvement that we made, and we
18 would like for the Board to see what, where the money
19 has gone. And we would also like to give them a tour of
20 our existing terminal building facility, point out the
21 need for the building renovation. So I would like to
22 invite you all to come up and join us for lunch. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. OBERNDORF: Thank you.

25 NOTE: Unable to hearing remarks made by Board

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Members.

2 MR. SWAIN: That was the last request for Region

3 3.

4 Region 2 is next. Page 69. We have
5 Ingalls Field. Ingalls, we have three requests. First
6 is Runway Safety Area Extension and Obstruction Removal
7 Design Increase, \$950.47. Secondary Containment
8 Certification, \$1,480.00. And Storm Water Pollution
9 Prevention Plan, \$3,508.00. On the Runway Safety Area
10 Extension and Obstruction Removal, the staff recommends
11 funding this project. This project is part of an
12 overall obstruction removal process. On the Secondary
13 Containment Certification, the staff recommends not
14 funding this project as it is not eligible under the
15 Board policy, and the airport has unmitigated FAR Part
16 77 obstructions. That was the original remark as of
17 August 15th. We received certification from the airport
18 that they have mitigated their obstruction, but on that
19 Secondary Containment, it is still an ineligible project
20 on the Board policy. On the Storm Water Pollution
21 Prevention Plan, the staff recommends not funding this
22 project as previously said, because at the time it had
23 unmitigated obstruction. The obstruction has since been
24 certified as clear.

25 Next, Shenandoah Valley Regional.

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Request for Air Carrier and Transient Apron
2 Rehabilitation Design, in the amount of \$3,000.00. The
3 staff recommends funding this project.

4 And that's it for Region 2.

5 Region 1. Should I slow down?

6 MR. OMPS: You are doing great.

7 MR. SWAIN: First airport in Region 1 is Grundy
8 Municipal. The request being, the project is an
9 Environmental Assessment for Replacement Airport,
10 \$2,700.00. The staff recommends not funding this
11 project as no FAA funds have been programmed. There is
12 no approved airport layout plan. The airport has
13 unmitigated threshold, FAA threshold siting criteria and
14 safe standard obstructions, and the required based
15 aircraft survey has not been received.

16 Next is Lee County. First project is
17 Fueling System, AV Gas Tank Construction, requesting
18 \$115,526.31. Terminal Area Site Preparation
19 Construction, \$184,905.60. And Terminal Building
20 Construction, \$775,889.62. The Fueling System AV Gas
21 Tank, the staff recommends funding this project. On the
22 Terminal Area Site Preparation Construction, the staff
23 recommends funding this project. And on the Terminal
24 Building Construction the staff recommends funding this
25 project.

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1
2 MR. PAGE: Mike, can we go back to Grundy? We
3 are just learning some things down here. I'm sorry I
4 slowed you down, whether you wanted to or not. Just
5 that the plan for Grundy as it sets now, I was wondering
6 if the Board was aware where that stands? And what the
7 ultimate plan was? And maybe I should mention that,
8 since I brought it up. But we had meetings with the
9 town of Grundy Department, and they have -- the airport
10 sets on top of a fairly large seam of coal. And the
11 plan, there was a study underway that we funded to find
12 a replacement site for the airport, try and relocate
13 some place where it could meet standards, get a longer
14 runway. And the best site that they decided on, at
15 least at this point, is to actually close the airport,
16 remove the coal, lower the site by lowering the mountain
17 you get a larger foot print to work on, replace the
18 airport back on the site, use the revenue from the coal
19 to pay for reconstruction of the airport. The ultimate
20 plan, as it is going forward right now, is actually to
21 rebuild an airport on the same site. That will
22 obviously shut down the airport for a number of years
23 while the coal is mined, the process of getting
24 environmental approval for coal mining, coal mining
25 operation. I didn't know how many of the Board members

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 were aware of what was in the works at Grundy. We still
2 don't have a final airport layout plan for the site.
3 The environmental, but that's a process, as I
4 understand, that the town of Grundy is going forward
5 with.

6 MR. DIX: It's a unique --

7 MR. PAGE: Crunch.

8 MR. DIX: And the coal is going to pay for the
9 whole thing?

10 MR. PAGE: I don't know if it is going to pay
11 for the whole thing but it will pay, take the royalty
12 from the coal, the value of coal is today, it will pay
13 for a large portion of it. And also it's a great site
14 for industrial development on top of this plateau that
15 they will have. It will save the coal mining company a
16 little bit because they don't have to do mountain top
17 restoration. The site is used for other another public
18 purpose.

19 BOARD MEMBER: Do we have money to program? Are
20 they in the program for this project cost?

21 MR. PAGE: The money is in place for the airport
22 layout plan on the new site, on the same site, is lower
23 for that planning. Environmentally, the way we worked
24 it out, the environmental, we have got a coal mining
25 operation because the main environmental impact is

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 stripping the mountain of the coal, not building an
2 airport. But that environmental would accommodate the
3 final airport operation on that site, and at the same
4 time, if they would get cooperating agency with the coal
5 mining, that one environmental documents serves both of
6 them.

7 MR. KEHOE: Is this a secondary document -- --
8 (unable to hear and understand)

9 MR. PAGE: In my opinion the town wanted to see
10 about getting, came to us for us to fund it. We said we
11 are not going to fund an environmental for a coal mining
12 operation. So either the coal mining company, or the
13 town or, use your revenue that you are expected to pay
14 for that work. We believe that's appropriate thing for
15 us to pay for. I think the Department's recommendation
16 is much the same. Function of the coal mine. There's a
17 minor portion of that environmental to address the long
18 term operation of an airport; that's minor compared to
19 strip the top of a mountain range.

20 BOARD MEMBER: (Cannot hear and understand.)

21 MR. PAGE: I think they are firmly pushing
22 forward with this, support of the Congressman out in
23 that area. I don't think there is anything that would
24 hold it up other than the coal prices dropping
25 significantly, something like that. I'll give them 90

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 percent going forward.

2 BOARD MEMBER: Terry, at the last meeting we
3 had, I think we found a lot of support on the community
4 for this program. You also had congressional support.
5 It did look like it was going to be an extended amount
6 of time as they tried to figure out when the right time
7 to do the coal mining was, and couldn't get any specific
8 date or anything like that out of the coal company or
9 the community, as I recall.

10 MR. PAGE: That is correct. We put together a
11 pretty extensive record of what we understand the plan
12 was, step by step. I think there were fifteen or twenty
13 points there, that we got back and it was all
14 coordinated with the clerks in our office and the town
15 of Grundy to make sure we are all on board with what we
16 think the plan is to go forward. Time wise, I think
17 the over all time from start to finish is about one year
18 the environmental process, about two to three years the
19 coal mining process, and then another year to rebuild
20 the runway on top. It was very strongly supported by
21 both counties down there and the town of Grundy.

22 BOARD MEMBER: And it is a very interesting
23 airport presently to fly into.

24 BOARD MEMBER: What is the ultimate, from the
25 time that the airport closes, what is the nearest

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 airport?

2 BOARD MEMBER: Tazewell, isn't it?

3 MR. PAGE: Probably about half way between
4 Tazewell and Lonesome Pine Line County. It looks like
5 it's two of those. There is also an airport in Kentucky
6 to the northwest, Pike County.

7 BOARD MEMBER: (Unable to understand)

8 MR. OBERNDORF: Okay. Let's get back to Lee
9 County.

10 MR. SWAIN: Lee County, I believe we have read
11 the recommendations for all three projects. The staff
12 is recommending funding.

13 BOARD MEMBER: Randy, you said the trailer that
14 is there, is closed now?

15 MR. BURDETTE: They have got a trailer there on
16 blocks. The last time I visited, I went there it was
17 locked up. There is really not much access. Do you
18 guys have any good news on that?

19 BOARD MEMBER: No.

20 MR. BURDETTE: It was just parked there. I'm
21 kind of excited about the project they got there. The
22 Fueling System, the Terminal Site Preparation and the
23 Terminal Building, because you put a nice airfield out
24 there, you go there, there is no phone. I had a great
25 limited cell coverage. You are there for a visit, you

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 may have a time getting into town.

2 MR. OBERNDORF: That's what led to our
3 discussions about a complete airport package. Like we
4 are going to get in Tappahannock. The question I have
5 will there be an operator, if we put all this stuff in,
6 will there be an operator and base aircraft to support?

7 BOARD MEMBER: They say they have eleven based
8 airplanes present. And there is no facilities.

9 MR. OBERNDORF: Yes. So it it attract more
10 aircraft?

11 BOARD MEMBER: I think it will.

12 MR. SWAIN: Mr. Chairman, I would assume they
13 have bids in hand hand and ready to go on this terminal
14 project. I would assume they would break ground if the
15 Board approves the funds, or unless there is some
16 outstanding circumstance say a latent spring. I'm
17 pretty sure they will start building this fall on that
18 site.

19 MR. OBERNDORF: The staff is recommending
20 approval?

21 MR. SWAIN: Yes, sir.

22 Lonesome Pine. First request is for
23 Environmental Assessment for Future Development,
24 \$8,550.00. Second is Fisal Year 2008 Disadvantaged
25 Business Enterprise Promise Update, \$300.00. Third,

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan,
2 \$6,800.00. On Environmental Assessment for Future
3 Development, the staff recommends against funding the
4 project as the airport has unmitigated FAR Part 77
5 obstructions. And at the time of the recommendation, we
6 noted that the lease agreement for the off-airport
7 access had not been received. Those agreements have now
8 been received by our office, and the AV's office.

9 On the fiscal year 2008 DBE Program
10 Update, the staff recommends against funding this
11 project, as the airport has unmitigated FAR Part 77
12 obstructions. The lease agreement is not an issue any
13 more, however the project is not eligible as a stand
14 alone project. It is typically eligible as part of an
15 AIC project.

16 And on the Spill Prevention Control
17 Countermeasures Plan, the staff recommends against
18 funding the project as the airport has unmitigated
19 obstructions, FAR Part 77 obstructions.

20 One other item on that, that was not
21 noted, is that the airport is currently undergoing an
22 ALC update. I believe the final draft has been
23 forwarded to the State FAA, but it has not been reviewed
24 and commented on yet. That's another issue respecting
25 all three projects.

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Next is New River Valley. Project is
2 Runway 6-24 Rehabilitation Design, \$9,000, and the staff
3 recommends funding this project.

4 Tazewell County. The project is
5 Airport Drainage Preliminary Design and Environmental
6 Assessment, \$1,950.00, the staff recommends funding this
7 project.

8 Twin County. The first project is AV
9 Gas System Pump Upgrade, \$10,620.00. And Runway Safety
10 Area Extension Design, \$6,000.00. On the AV Gas System
11 Pump Upgrade, the staff recommends funding this project.
12 On the Runway Safety Area Extension, the staff
13 recommends not funding this project as no FAA funds have
14 been programmed for that fiscal year. I believe the
15 program for fiscal year 2009.

16 BOARD MEMBER: What kind of pump is that that
17 costs \$15,000.00 on the fuel system?

18 Is that self-service?

19 MR. SWAIN: They stated they have a one-third
20 horsepower motor, and I remember when they came in for
21 this they had, take forever to fill anything over fifty
22 gallons. I'm not sure if it's an issue due to the
23 design of the fuel farm, if it's a specialized pump, if
24 it's just an upgrade or not. We would typically look at
25 those numbers closer before we put a project like this

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 under grant. They do have quotes for this, which is
2 basically bids received, but it is not a true design
3 type project. Before we go under grant, we would look
4 at that and verify.

5 MR. PAGE: Can you find out what it is because
6 it technically is way out of line -- -- fuel system.

7 MR. SWAIN: Sure.

8 BOARD MEMBER: The narrative sort of suggests
9 that it is a replacement rather than an upgrade.

10 MR. SWAIN: Yes, they are replacing the pump to
11 get a larger quantity of fuel flow out of their system.
12 We will verify that. I will get back with you on the
13 type.

14 BOARD MEMBER: The system, not a pump.

15 MR. SWAIN: In the bid that they have a
16 comparison.

17 BOARD MEMBER: It must be the system rather than
18 a pump. Probably includes a lot of the piping.

19 MR. FRANKLIN: Yes. It might include repiping.

20 MR. SWAIN: Virginia Highlands. Four requests.
21 The first is Acquire Easement Runway 24, Phase 2,
22 \$3,429.16. Land Acquisition for the Wright Equipment
23 Property, \$63,157.00. Land Acquisition Services, Runway
24 6, \$6,000.00. And Spill Prevention Control and
25 Countermeasures Plan, \$7,420.00. On the Acquire

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Easements Runway 24, Phase 2, the staff recommends not
2 funding this project as the sponsor has an existing T.A.
3 for this project. On the Land Acquisition for Wright
4 Equipment, the staff recommends funding this project.
5 The project is part of an overall obstruction removal
6 process. Land Acquisition Services, Runway 6, the staff
7 recommends not funding this project as the airport has
8 unmitigated FAR Part 77 obstructions and no FA funds
9 have been programmed. And Spill Prevention Control and
10 Countermeasures Plan, the Staff recommends not funding
11 this project as the airport has unmitigated FAR Part 77
12 obstructions.

13 Next is Virginia Tech-Montgomery
14 Executive. First request is for Apron Expansion, Phase
15 2, Increase Missed Opportunity, \$8,853.84. And
16 Environmental Assessment for Future Development,
17 \$15,000.00. The Apron Expansion Project, the staff
18 recommends funding this project. This Missed
19 Opportunity was due to high bids. The airport had a
20 T.A. for this project; the bids came in above the
21 estimate. On the Environmental Assessment for Future
22 Development, the staff recommends funding this project.

23 That's it for Region 1.

24 MR. OBERNDORF: Any other comments from the
25 Board? Staff? Thank the Board for going over this

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 morning.

2

3 MR. BURDETTE: When we get through here shortly,
4 there is the 11:30 bus pick up; in the meantime the.
5 Redevelopment Clinic courses are available at 10:30.

6 MR. OBERNDORF: The meeting is adjourned.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

